1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
7	REGION 10 1200 Sixth Avenue
8	Seattle, Washington
9	In the matter of:
10	HECKMAN RANCHES, INC. and
11	HECKMAN CATTLE CO.) DOCKET NO. CWA-10-2000-0128
12	White Bird, Idaho,) COMPLAINT
13	Respondents.
14	
15	
16	I. <u>AUTHORITIES</u>
17	1. This administrative complaint for civil penalties ("Complaint") is issued under the
18	authority vested in the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or
19	"Complainant") by Section 309(g)(2)(B) of the Clean Water Act ("Act"), 33 U.S.C. § 1319(g)(2)(B).
20	The Administrator has delegated this authority to the Regional Administrator of EPA, Region 10,
21	who in turn has redelegated it to the Director, Office of Water.
22	2. Pursuant to Section 309(g)(2)(B) of the Act, and in accordance with the
23	"Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties," 40
24	C.F.R. Part 22 ("Part 22 Rules"), Complainant hereby proposes the assessment of a civil penalty
25	against Heckman Ranches, Inc. and Heckman Cattle Co. ("Respondents") for the unlawful
26	discharge of pollutants into navigable waters in violation of Section 301(a) of the Act, 33 U.S.C.
27	§ 1311(a).
28	
	U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY COMPLAINT - 1 1200 Sixth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 553-1037

10 11 12

13 14

16 17

15

18 19

20

21 22

> 23 24

2526

2728

II. <u>ALLEGATIONS</u>

- 3. Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), prohibits the "discharge of a pollutant" by any person to navigable waters of the United States, except, *inter alia*, as authorized by a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit issued pursuant to Section 402 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1342. Section 504(12) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(12), defines the term "discharge of a pollutant" to include "any addition of any pollutant to navigable waters from any point source."
- 4. Each of the Respondents is a corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of Idaho and therefore a "person" within the meaning of Section 502(5) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(5).
- Respondents operate a beef cattle feeding operation that is located adjacent to the confluence of Price Creek and White Bird Creek in Idaho County, Idaho.
- 6. Respondents' beef cattle feeding operation contains a number of unvegetated, fenced beef cattle pens and barns ("White Bird Creek Facility") in which cattle are stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period.
- 7. Neither crops, vegetation, forage growth, nor post-harvest residues are sustained over any portion of the White Bird Creek Facility.
- 8. The White Bird Creek Facility is an "animal feeding operation" as that phrase is defined in 40 C.F.R. § 122.23(b)(1).
- 9. On March 3, 2000, EPA conducted an aerial overflight of the White Bird Creek Facility. At the time of this overflight, the White Bird Creek Facility confined more than 300 slaughter or feeder cattle, and these animals had direct access to White Bird Creek and Price Creek.
- On March 15, 2000, EPA conducted an NPDES inspection of the White Bird Creek Facility.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 1200 Sixth Avenue

Seattle, Washington 98101

(206) 553-1037

COMPLAINT - 2

- 11. At the time of the March 15, 2000 NPDES inspection, the White Bird Creek Facility confined more than 300 slaughter or feeder cattle.
- 12. At the time of the March 15, 2000 NPDES inspection, animal wastes and other pollutants were being discharged directly into White Bird Creek and Price Creek. White Bird Creek and Price Creek originate outside of and pass over, across, or through the White Bird Creek Facility and come into direct contact with the animals confined in the White Bird Creek Facility.
- 13. The White Bird Creek Facility does not discharge only in the event of a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.
- 14. The White Bird Creek Facility is a "concentrated animal feeding operation" as that phrase is defined in 40 C.F.R. Part 122, Appendix B and used in Section 502(14) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).
- 15. White Bird Creek and Price Creek are tributaries of the Salmon River. The Salmon River is a tributary of the Snake River, which is an interstate water.
- 16. White Bird Creek and Price Creek are each "navigable waters" as defined by Section 502(7) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7), and "waters of the United States" within the meaning of 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.2.
- 17. The animal wastes discharged from the White Bird Creek Facility were and contained "pollutant[s]" within the meaning of Section 502(6) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(6).
- 18. Upon information and belief, cattle from the White Bird Creek Facility have come into direct contact with White Bird Creek and Price Creek each day they have been present at the facility. Each day in which cattle have come into contact with White Bird Creek and Price Creek has resulted in discharges of animal wastes and other pollutants to waters of the United States.
- 19. The animal waste discharges described in Paragraph 18 above constituted "discharge[s] of pollutants" within the meaning of Section 502(12) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(12), from a "point source" within the meaning of Section 502(14) of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1362(14).

- 20. At the time of the discharges of pollutants described in Paragraph 18 above, Respondents had not obtained coverage under an NPDES permit for the discharges from the White Bird Creek Facility.
- 21. The discharges of pollutants described in Paragraph 18 above were unauthorized discharges of pollutants to waters of the United States and constitute no less than thirteen (13) violations of Section 301 of the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Consequently, pursuant to Section 309(g)(2)(B) of the Act, and 40 C.F.R. Part 19, the Respondents are jointly and severally liable for the administrative assessment of civil penalties in an amount not to exceed \$11,000 per violation for each day during which the violation continues, up to a maximum of \$137,500.

III. PROPOSED PENALTY

- 22. Based on the foregoing allegations of violation, Complainant hereby proposes that the Presiding Officer assess an administrative penalty against Respondents, for the violations cited above, in the amount of FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$40,000).
- 23. The proposed penalty amount was determined by Complainant in consideration of the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation, and, with respect to the Respondents, ability to pay, prior history of violations, degree of culpability, economic benefit and savings resulting from the violation, and other appropriate factors to the extent the information is available for such determinations.
- 24. The nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violations described above are significant. The violations resulted in the discharge of manure-laden animal waste to waters of the United States. Samples of the discharges associated with White Bird Creek Facility contained significant levels of both fecal coliform and *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) bacteria. The presence of these bacteria indicates the possible presence of a number of pathogens (such as *E. coli 0157:H7* and *Salmonella*) as well as parasites (such as *Cryptosporidium*). Illnesses caused by these microorganisms can result in gastroenteritis, fever, kidney failure, and even death. Animal wastes are also typically high in nutrients which can cause decreased oxygen levels in

COMPLAINT - 4

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 1200 Sixth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 553-1037

30. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 22.15, Respondents' Answer(s) must clearly and directly admit, deny, or explain each of the factual allegations contained in this Complaint with regard to which Respondents have any knowledge. Respondents' Answer(s) must also state: (1) the circumstances or arguments which are alleged to constitute the grounds of defense; (2) the facts which Respondents intend to place at issue; and (3) whether a hearing is requested. Failure to admit, deny, or explain any material factual allegation contained herein constitutes an admission of the allegation.

VI. INFORMAL SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

31. Whether or not Respondents request a hearing, Respondents may request an informal settlement conference to discuss the facts of this case, the proposed penalty, and the possibility of settling this matter. To request such a settlement conference, Respondents should contact:

R. David Allnutt Assistant Regional Counsel U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10 1200 Sixth Avenue, Mail Stop ORC-158 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 553-2581

- 32. Note that a request for an informal settlement conference does not extend the thirty (30) day period for filing a written Answer to this Complaint, nor does it waive Respondents' right to request a hearing.
- 33. Respondent is advised that Section 22.8 of the Part 22 Rules prohibits any *ex parte* (unilateral) discussion of the merits of these or any other factually related proceedings with the Administrator, the Environmental Appeals Board or its members, the Regional Administrator, the Presiding Officer, or any other person who is likely to advise these officials on any decision in this case.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 1200 Sixth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 553-1037

COMPLAINT - 6

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	VII. <u>RESERVATIONS</u>
6	34. Neither assessment nor payment of an administrative civil penalty pursuant to this
7	Complaint shall affect Respondents' continuing obligations to comply with: (1) the Clean Water
8	Act and all other environmental statutes; (2) the terms and conditions of all applicable Clean
9	Water Act permits; and (3) any Compliance Order issued to Respondent under Section 309(a) of
10	the Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(a), concerning the violations alleged herein.
11	
12	Dated thisday of
13	
14	Randall F. Smith
15	Director Office of Water
16 17	U.S. EPA Region 10
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY COMPLAINT - 7 1200 Sixth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101

(206) 553-1037

1	
2	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
3	I certify that the foregoing "Complaint" was sent to the following persons, in the manner specified, on the date below:
4 5	Original and one copy, hand-delivered:
6	Mary Shillcutt, Regional Hearing Clerk U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
7	1200 Sixth Avenue, Mail Stop ORC-158 Seattle, Washington 98101
8	
9	Copy, together with a cover letters and copy of the Part 22 Rules, by certified mail, return receipt requested:
10	Donovan Heckman President, Registered Agent
11	Heckman Ranches, Inc
12	Heckman Cattle Co. P.O. Box 87
13	White Bird, Idaho 83554
14	
15	
16	
17	Dated: Cindy Phung
18	U.S. EPA Region 10
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY COMPLAINT - 8 1200 Sixth Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 553-1037